

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant

PIN	4436	COUNTY	Kern
APPLICANT	Mojave Desert-Mtn. Resource Conserv. & Dev. Council	AMOUNT REQUESTED	\$500,000
PROJECT TITLE	IRWM Plan for South Fork of the Kern River Watershed	TOTAL PROJECT COST	\$667,000

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

MD-M RC&D will hire a consultant group to lead the two year integrated planning process IRWM for the South Fork of the Kern River Watershed and Lake Isabella. Multiple agencies, communities, and stakeholders will be involved. Existing plans and plan elements will become a part of the new overall umbrella IRWM for the South Fork of the Kern River Watershed, USGS HUC 18030002 and Lake Isabella area environs.

WORK PLAN - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has a detailed and specific work plan that adequately documents the proposal. Weighting factor is 3.

Score: 6

Comment: The work plan provides a list of specific tasks. Work plan items are very general and don't correspond to other elements in the rest of the work plan. The work plan is not specific enough as a template to complete the work. Budget cost estimates are unsupported and deliverables are unclear. The applicant could have more clearly identified interim deliverables such as a comparison/summary of existing plans.

DESCRIPTION OF REGION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific description that adequately documents the region. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 2

Comment: The proposal does not clearly identify the region or demonstrate why the region is an appropriate area for management. It does not identify the boundaries of member agencies, locations of major water related infrastructure, or major land-use divisions. There is no map included in the work plan. It is not clear why the South Fork of the Kern River and Lake Isabella define the planning region. The main stem of the Kern River flows into the lake, but it is not included in the region even though flooding in the lake is a stated problem. The proposal does not describe the quantity, quality, or demand for the water supply in the region. It does not describe important ecological processes and environmental resources within the region. It provides a general description of the social and economical makeup of the region, but no empirical evidence is provided.

OBJECTIVES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific planning objectives. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 2

Comment: The application identifies planning objectives to be developed in the proposed IRWMP, but it is not clear how they work together or why they have been selected. The proposal does not address how they were developed or how the IRWMP will address major water related objectives and conflicts that will affect the available water supply, groundwater management, ecosystem restoration, and water quality. Proposal does not have a discussion of coordination efforts, how these objectives will be implemented throughout the region, or how these objectives will benefit statewide priorities. The applicant has reiterated guideline requirements without providing any detail on how they apply to the proposal.

INTEGRATION OF WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented how water management strategies will be integrated. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 4

Comment: The applicant identifies the water strategies that will play a large role in their planning efforts, but have provided no clear method to evaluate or select strategies for the IRWMP. The proposal does not address how the various existing water management strategies are to be incorporated into an integrated strategy to manage the region's water supply.

IMPLEMENTATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately detailed plan implementation. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 2

Comment: The application does not identify adequate means to implement the proposed IRWMP. The implementation schedule is a general concept and unrelated to the specifics of the IRWMP. The applicant proposes to develop an institutional structure consisting of a task force that will be assembled to write the IRWMP. No means of monitoring the performance of the IRWMP is defined.

IMPACTS AND BENEFITS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately presented and documented the impacts and benefits of the Plan. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 4

Comment: The proposal does not include a discussion of the potential impacts or benefits within the region. Applicant will hire a consultant to analyze potential impacts, collect information, and update the IRWMP as necessary to reflect changes resulting from the implementation of projects. Proposed impact and benefit analyses are suggested but not shown as project tasks under work plan items. The general plan for CEQA is to determine a lead agency or jurisdiction for each project.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant

DATA AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data and technical analysis components of the proposal. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 1

Comment: The applicant states that only limited data exists to support IRWMP development. The proposed planning includes the review of existing data to identify gaps in data or information needs. No technical studies are being planned to fill data gaps during development of the IRWMP.

DATA MANAGEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data management procedures. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 2

Comment: The proposal identifies posting to the Web, distribution of newsletters, and holding community meetings and events as the means to disseminate data to stakeholders, agencies, and the public. The IRWMP will identify data gaps but does not provide a process to fill the gaps or collect data during IRWMP development or plan implementation. They plan to link to statewide databases but do not explain how this will support statewide data needs.

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented stakeholder involvement concerns. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 3

Comment: Most key stakeholders are identified but their existing concerns are to be explored during development of the IRWMP. The proposal generally addresses the outreach effort to all of the listed stakeholders as well as the seven identified DACs. Environmental justice concerns will be addressed through participation of the DACs in the IRWMP development process. The Task Force and the Watershed Coordinator will continue to involve additional stakeholders during and after IRWMP development.

DISADVANTAGE COMMUNITIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented disadvantaged community concerns. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 4

Comment: There are seven DACs that will be targeted for representation in IRWMP development. Only general needs of DACs are noted and benefits of the IRWMP to them would not be direct. The application discusses some issues that directly affect these communities and identifies implementation projects that would benefit these communities.

RELATION TO LOCAL PLANNING - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented the Plan's relationship to local planning efforts. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 2

Comment: The proposal identifies several existing local planning documents that will form a foundation for the IRWMP, but does not indicate how these documents will relate to the IRWM strategies and the dynamics between the two levels of planning documents. The proposal does not have a well documented plan or strategy to integrate the IRWMP into the existing local planning documents and will rely on the grant to develop it.

AGENCY COORDINATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented agency coordination issues. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 3

Comment: The proposal does not identify in detail how the IRWMP will facilitate coordination with local land use planning decision making or with State and federal regulatory agencies. There needs to be a more detailed plan in place to get agencies to participate in the IRWMP process.

TOTAL SCORE: 35